

# ARTICLES

## The Russia-Ukraine War in Western Media: A Psycholinguistic Modelling of the ‘Hybrid’ Phase

Ivan Danyliuk <sup>a</sup>, Olena Bohucharova <sup>b,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine

<sup>b</sup> Donetsk State University of Internal Affairs, Ukraine

Received October 3, 2023; Revised December 4, 2023; Accepted December 7, 2023



**Abstract.** The article presents a conceptualisation of English-language media discourse in the retrospective of the ‘hybrid’ phase of the Russia-Ukraine war from 2014 to 2021. The study aims to analyse the psycholinguistic features of the cognitive modelling of the war in Ukraine in English-language media and investigate the psychosemantic components of the Western media audience’s attitude towards the war. Psycholinguistic media monitoring, discourse analysis, semantic-cognitive analysis, content analysis, and Semantic Differential (SD) were used to study the media discourse of the Russia-Ukraine war. The results indicate that the discourse is emotionally positive but controversial, which may hinder the Western audience’s understanding of the realities of the war. The newspaper media discourse includes psychosemantic components such as neutral concepts like ‘conflict’ and ‘crisis’. These concepts are often expressed through conceptual metaphors such as ‘war’, which can be viewed as a path, a game, a business, or a theatre. Additionally, euphemisms and abbreviations (such as ATO) are commonly used, along with an abundance of vocabulary that has positive connotations. There has been a shift in emphasis from the strong concept of ‘war’ to neutral academic nominalisations, such as ‘event’. The study’s results confirmed the Western media audience’s paradoxical perception of the war. As military activity intensifies, positive assessments of the victorious war tend to decrease, leading to a drop in media ratings. These findings have potential applications in studying Western attitudes towards war and in the cognitive modelling of media content. This is particularly relevant given the future dangers of Russian aggression in 2022.

**Keywords:** hybrid phase, the Russia-Ukraine war, Western media, Semantic Differential, concept, media discourse, cognitive modelling.

**Данилюк Іван, Богучарова Олена. Російсько-українська війна в західних масмедіа: Психолінгвістичне моделювання гібридної фази.**

**Анотація.** У статті представлено концептуалізацію англomовного медійного дискурсу в ретроспективі “гібридної” фази російсько-української війни 2014-2021 років. Мета дослідження – проаналізувати психолінгвістичні особливості когнітивного моделювання війни в Україні в англomовних ЗМІ та дослідити психосемантичні складники ставлення західної медіа-аудиторії до війни. Для дослідження медіа-дискурсу російсько-української війни було використано методи психолінгвістичного моніторингу ЗМІ, дискурс-аналізу,

---

\* Olena Bohucharova,  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5617-9175>,  [bogucharova\\_o@i.ua](mailto:bogucharova_o@i.ua)

© Danyliuk, Ivan; Bohucharova, Olena, 2023. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Licence (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>).  
*East European Journal of Psycholinguistics*, 10(2), 9–20. <https://doi.org/10.29038/eejpl.2023.10.2.dan>

семантико-когнітивного аналізу, контент-аналізу та семантичного диференціалу (СД). Результати свідчать, що дискурс є емоційно позитивним, але суперечливим, що може перешкоджати розумінню західною аудиторією реалій війни. Дискурс газетних ЗМІ включає психосемантичні компоненти, такі як нейтральні поняття “конфлікт” і “криза”. Ці поняття часто виражаються через концептуальні метафори, такі як “війна”, яка може розглядатися як шлях, гра, бізнес або театр. Крім того, широко використовуються евфемізми та аббревіатури (наприклад, АТО), а також велика кількість лексики з позитивною конотацією. Відбулося зміщення акцентів від радикального поняття “війна” до нейтральних академічних номінацій, таких як “подія”. Результати дослідження засвідчили парадоксальне сприйняття війни західною медіа-аудиторією. Із посиленням військової активності позитивні оцінки переможної війни мають тенденцію до зниження, що призводить до падіння медіа-рейтингів. Ці висновки мають потенційне застосування у вивченні ставлення Заходу до війни та когнітивному моделюванні медіаконтенту. Це особливо актуально з огляду на майбутню небезпеку російської агресії у 2022 році.

***Ключові слова:** гібридна фаза, російсько-українська війна, західні медіа, семантичний диференціал, концепт, медіа-дискурс, когнітивне моделювання.*

## Introduction

Nowadays, the study of the different media discourses and their components – media concepts based on which the linguistic representation of war or problematic crises events of social reality is organised, is considered a priority linguistic task, in particular, cognitive linguistics, ethnolinguistics, media-linguistics, sociolinguistics (Geeraerts, 2006; Vasianovych, 2018).

At the same time, media discourse and its concepts are increasingly becoming the object of research in several psychological disciplines – psycholinguistics and media psycholinguistics, discursive psychology, cognitive psychology, and media psychology (Giles, 2003; Machykova, 2015; Naydonova, 2013; Zasiakina, 2010). Scientists from different disciplines are studying the discursive and conceptual sphere of the media because discourse and concept as communicative units are not purely linguistic notions. They have psychological, cognitive, psycholinguistic meaning and components. The psychological literature considers that the cognitive correctness of the linguistic modelling of an actual military event unfolds in a psycholinguistic context (Austin & Urmson, 1962). Meanwhile, discourse, concept, and text are critical as media-conceptual units in their essential psycholinguistic properties – logical perception and emotions (Saussure, 1995). In the psycholinguistic approach, moreover, the subject matter is the text as the speech message in the linguistic functioning processes in interactive media communication, as well as the discourse as verbal and thought activity in the processes of speech media broadcasting (Taranenko, 2017; Vilchynska, 2017), including on web platforms. In this way, the authors regard concepts and conceptual metaphors of war, armed confrontation, and military phenomena as a cognitive process of conceptualisation and verbal interpretation. Then, the potential of the concept to model the world is realised “in” and “by” the cognitive modelling of the war in media discourse (Bell, 1995). This fact confirms the psychological importance of the concepts for the human linguistic picture of the world.

It should also be remembered that the level of media discourse is interpersonal, and therefore, the one where the addressant (media) influences the addressee (mass audience) through language. For instance, it is considered that military conceptual metaphor imposes confrontational stereotypes on social reality (Lakoff, 1999; Panther & Thornburg, 2017; Rumiantseva, 2014). Otherwise, language often acts as a means of realising conflict confrontation in media (Howard, 2019b).

From this perspective, we turn to the real armed confrontation in the east of Ukraine in 2014-2021 to understand its media meaning as a factor of the war on 02/24/22. Problematic points are revealed in the actual military events and their media presentation, according to their psychological perception, particularly by the Western media audience (Buckholz, 2017; Driscoll, 2019).

In this regard, the media content of this real war needs authentic, valid conceptual media representation and psychologically adequate cognitive media modelling (Broslavska, 2015). That is why cognitive media modelling requires powerful linguistic and psycholinguistic analytics, in particular, according to one of the possible socio-psychological extensions (Kellner, 2010; Neverson & Adeyanju, 2018) of the sociological theory of media events (Dayan & Katz, 1992).

It should be considered that such analytics is proactive and is built around conflicting social interests, various controversial agendas, protest discourses, and conflictogenous speech communication in the media (Bacallao-Pino, 2016; Sumiala, 2016).

Furthermore, the Russia-Ukraine war is an example of a resonant, multi-vector armed confrontation with many alternative interpretations. The discourse of such phenomena in the mass media sometimes unfolds through concepts designed to convey not a particular meaning of acute military conflict reality as it aims to achieve a programmed pragmatic (communicative) positive/ negative impact on the audience. That is the basis of media concepts of Western democratic journalistic intelligence investigations regarding the hidden Russian aggression in Ukraine in 2014–2021, which lies in the purposeful, conscious selection of language material.

At the media-communicative and psycholinguistic level, this is often confirmed as the art of journalistic investigative mastery skill or successful media technologies of “soft power” and facilitating, soft positive influence (Imbir, 2017).

As American diplomat Nye (2011) formulated the concept of “soft power”, it “is the ability to change the behavior of others to get what you want. There are three ways to do this: coercion, payment, and attractiveness (soft power)”(p. 9).

It is the linguistic techniques of media processing of actual war that often act in the direction of “softening” the severity of armed confrontation and also achieving political correctness of language within the linguistic, conceptual field of the phenomenon of war itself, for example, thanks to euphemisms, embellishing its meaning and consequences.

These soft, delicate, positive means of psycholinguistic influence, in turn, significantly enhance the discourse of the so-called doublespeak. According to this, for the nomination of problematic phenomena of highly controversial events in the media, it is considered necessary to use evaluative units to attract euphemisms of an argot nature (Tatsenko, 2013) and a “mannered and gentle way of paraphrasing”

problematic and military topics such as a war (Karimnia & Khodashenas, 2016, p. 65). In the era of the information revolution, as Western media theoreticians believe, the factor of attractiveness (“soft power”) will be more critical than a devastating military advantage. Then, in the psycholinguistic and media-psychological context, the Russian-Ukrainian war is a hybrid war and a new form of hybrid media event, which consists of actual bloodied military fighting, dirty information and psychological operations (IPSO) and their “attractive”(“soft”) media content.

The abovementioned issues remain poorly studied, even though various interdisciplinary studies of the Russian-Ukrainian war in 2014–2021 have occupied their niche in the domestic and international scientific literature (Berg & Mölder, 2018; Matsievskiy, 2019).

This research aims to analyse the psycholinguistic features of cognitive media-modelling of the “hybrid” phase of the war in Ukraine in English-language media discourse to investigate the psychosomatic components of attitude in the mass consciousness of the Western media audience.

## Method

The material of the research is a set of publications in the World (English) section of English-language websites, such as *The Guardian*, *The Washington Post*, *The Economist*, *Time*, *Atlantic Council*, *Foreign Affairs*, *The New York Times*, *Reuters*, as well as sites, services, and platforms of the channels *BBC*, *CNN*, *Radio Free Europe*, *Radio Liberty*.

The method of psycholinguistic media monitoring involved searching both news and analytical materials of the above-mentioned English-language media outlets for information concerning the armed conflict in eastern Ukraine and attitudes to this one of the West. A large volume of media texts compiled randomly from 1072 articles and reports of 2014–2021 was analysed. The total number of words in the articles and radio reports is 891,415 (digital versions of relevant platforms and websites).

The content analysis method included a comparative analysis of the media activity of relevant websites during the specified period, qualitative analysis of lexical media content of articles and messages, detection of keywords, and frequency of their use (Foltovych et al., 2017).

Discourse analysis within discursive psychology has contributed to the study of the role of discursive means of mitigation, discredit, manipulation, masking, dissent – “doublespeak” and euphemism in the media presentation of controversial events and clarifying their essence from the standpoint of the psycholinguistic theory (Gomez, 2009). Besides, the semantic-cognitive analysis method consisted of the interpretation of the concepts as objects of cognitive modelling (Pavlenko, 2016)

The semantic differential method (SD scale) allowed us to identify the specifics of evaluation (perception, attitudes) of the modern English-language audience of the media concepts and their lexical derivatives as keywords of the armed conflict in eastern Ukraine and to rank the set of media key concepts proposed for evaluation by

the score. The methodological basis of the psychosemantic research was classical works (Osgood, 1952).

The sample of the vocabulary of media key concepts was formed by the “snowball” method. The criteria for selecting concepts were the frequency of their use and structural and semantic features. The empirical research was conducted online with a sample of respondents. It was carried out through a mailing list to 500 users of the social network Facebook, the subscribers to English-language electronic publications. Two hundred five volunteers answered our research request; among respondents aged 21 to 49, a majority of 96.5% was recorded; 100% of the following categories of respondents took part: executives (with higher education – 87.6%), master’s students (with bachelor’s degree, unfinished higher education – 12.4%) (females, n=180; males, n=45). Each term used to denote the events in eastern Ukraine had to be evaluated for each pair from a list of 12 pairs of antonyms on a scale of –5 to +5. The evaluation was performed for each of the words separately. The processing of results is presented as descriptive statistics (average calculation methods are the methods of average group analysis and intergroup correlations).

## Results and Discussion

Considering all the above, we analysed the media-activity of the British and American Mass Media in 2014–2020 (e-publication). The year’s distribution of frequency rate is presented in Table 1.

### Descriptive Statistics and Comparisons

Table 1

*Distribution of the WAR in Media Discourse’ Publications in the British and US Media, 2014–2021, Number/ Per Cent*

<b>Media country year</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>	<b>2016</b>	<b>2017</b>	<b>2018</b>	<b>2019</b>	<b>2020</b>	<b>2021</b>	<b>Total number</b>
<b>UK</b>	35 / 8.3	67 / 15.9	75 / 17.8	83 / 19.7	90 / 21.3	44 / 10.4	20 / 4.7	8 / 1.9	422 / 39.4
<b>USA</b>	15 / 2.3	58 / 8.9	100 / 15.4	117 / 18.0	184 / 12.9	81 / 12.5	75 / 11.5	20 / 3.1	650 / 60.6
<b>Total</b>	50 / 10.6	125 / 24.8	175 / 33.2	200 / 38.4	174 / 34.2	125 / 22.9	95 / 16.2	28 / 5.0	1072 / 100

As we can see, there is a noticeable discrepancy between British and American media activity regarding the concept of war (the difference between the concepts and

their cognitive features peaks in 2014–2021). It was in 2014, and 2018 had the lowest and highest media activity. Moreover, it is precisely the concepts of “war”, “conflict”, and “crisis” that provoke the most significant interest in the respondent’s samples in these years (87% of the sample of the entire English-speaking media audience). British e-publications were twice as much as American ones and vice versa, with Americans twice as much as British in 2014/2018.

Moreover, the concept that reflects the warfare in Ukraine and which is most often found in the British media is CRISIS (30% terminology’s vocabulary). This concept is constantly reproduced even in the headlines of the British BBC and other news services and publications (“The UK is guilty of sleepwalking into the crisis in Ukraine and has not been as active or visible as it should be”, “Russian minister accuses European politicians of stoking Ukraine CRISIS”). At the same time, the concept of CONFLICT is more prevalent in the American press (45% of the terminology’s vocabulary). The validity of our data is strengthened by the results of different analytical monitoring reports (Eye et al., 2017).

In general, the concept sphere of the English-language media regarding the war in Ukraine is saturated with numerous concepts, metaphors, and slots of the following content: “short-lived war” (war is back on the high road); “confrontation” (for a more significant confrontation); “stoking crisis” (...stoking Ukraine crisis); “tense situation” (to further inflame the tense situation in the country); “conflict with pro-Russia rebels” (conflict with pro-Russia rebels); “military intervention” (to warn Russia against military intervention in Ukraine). So, eventually, interpreting the events in Ukraine in the English-language media seems to be based on semi-neutral concepts such as CRISIS and CONFLICT. However, they are followed by military nominations and even the WAR token.

In the coverage of the bloody conflict in Ukraine in the English-language media, along with nominations that have a sharply negative assessment (“the deaths”; “spark a war”; “danger, costing the lives of at least 1,500 people”), there are other lexemes: “hunting”, “risk”, “betting in the game”, and “gambling or sports, or card game”. This image of war as a game is usually formed by several phrases or meanings, in which, as a rule, one refutes the other. The military nominations of concepts like CRISIS and CONFLICT coexist and even compete with GAME nominations (56/43% military/game nominations). Thus, the structure of the concepts here shows another image of war – gambling, game, rivalry, hypocrisy, blasphemy, giveaways, and “Ukraine is a toy” (Ukraine is a toy in the hands of the Russian Federation and the EU). For instance, when the armed confrontation or reports of military movements are “The West responded with phone calls” and condemns. However, it emphasises that this is not enough (Condemnation is not enough for Russian actions in Crimea).

Hence, the concepts of CRISIS and CONFLICT are correlated with the concepts and metaphors of WAR – “uncertainty”, “risk”, “death”, “chaos” as well as “game” – “gambling,” “competition”, “winning”, “leader-winner” and so on. The most common concepts and conceptual metaphors in a sample of news and analytical materials in 2018 – the year of the highest media activity of the above publications of the

English-language media – as to a war are “road” (112 expressions), “combat theatre” (80), “armed journey” (63), “military commerce” (43), “gambling” (32 expressions).

Thus, the representation of these concepts in the media texts of news portals reflects the heterogeneity of their structural and semantic content in the frame of war cognitive media-modeling in mass media-discourse of the hybrid phase in 2014–2021.

The discourse analysis revealed that, in addition to concepts, media modelling is presented by three different mutually competing, highly conflictgenic media images of war with their corresponding ratio – 58/27/15% of the total volume of text units. These are 1) an emotionally-accentuated image of internal conflict or “civil war”, on the West expertise’s opinions, with metaphorical para-military models of rebellion, insurgency, separatism, bottom-up revolt; 2) a rationally symbolic image of external conflict or “hybrid war” with metaphorical military models of the fight, unjust, unfair Russia’s hidden aggression against Ukraine, on the opinions of the West and Ukraine researchers (Bachmann & Gunneriusson, 2015; Buckholz, 2017; Dodonov, 2015), that symbolise “little green men”, “the Russian aggressor” and “Ukrainian fighter-heroes”; 3) the image of peace – a pragmatic compromise by the metaphorical model of a peaceful world, a peaceful (conciliatory) consensus of Minsk-1, Minsk-2. We emphasise that in the entire volume of English-language texts, the image of internal conflict, rebellion (insurgency), resistance, and civil war prevails (58% of text units).

Suppose we analyse the English-language media discourse on bloody events in eastern Ukraine. In that case, using different nominatives requires the analytics of generating ambiguities of the concepts and their replacements. For example, shifting the emphasis from the acute nominative “war, “combatant,” and “killed civilians” to the relatively positive ones “frozen conflict”, “hybrid Internet warfare”, “little green men”, ATO, “the rebels” as the doublespeak and euphemism tools. The vast majority of the phrases describing the death of civilians are impersonal nominatives, such as black humour or code cypher – “collateral damage”, “civilian impacting”, “non-military casualty”, or “soft target”. In this sense, the discourse analysis showed that the discursive means of disguise, mitigation, discrediting, euphemism, and dissent play a significant role in the media coverage of the English-language media of the war in Ukraine as a hybrid event. Their use, as a rule, contributes to the deactualisation of the militarised image of the bloody conflict in Ukraine. That is why so-called doublespeak linguistic techniques of the media processing of the actual military bloody fights often work toward softening the conceptual field of these aggressive military operations, significantly enhancing the discourse effects of positive soft communicative influence.

To confirm the results of different linguistic and discursive analysis areas, we also considered it appropriate to use special psycholinguistic tools, particularly the Semantic Differential method (SD). The SD method allows us to assess, first of all, the connotative meaning of the concepts “war”, “conflict”, and “crisis” and their structural and semantic units-components.

Figure 1

*Assessment Ranks of Concepts and Their Structural and Semantic Units-Components with the Sphere-Target “War” in the English-speaking Mass Media of the Sample Within the Range 1 – 10*

Ranks	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<b>Terms</b>	W (C, H)	AC DF	OI MI	LGRM RA	REB INS MPR	C(G) PI	IC AA	FC CS	ATO JFO	DP PT

*Note.* 1. war (civil, hybrid); 2. armed conflict / deadly fighting; 3. overt intervention/ military involvement; 4. “little green men” without insignia, polite people/Russian armour; 5. rebels, insurgents/ Maidan protesters; 6. crisis (geopolitical)/ peace initiatives; 7. international conflict/armed aid; 8. frozen conflict/ceasefire; 9. anti-terrorist operation/ joint forces operation; 10. diplomatic pressure/ peace talks

It is captivating that ‘camouflage’, ‘mitigating’, or truly neutral words (international conflict, frozen conflict, diplomatic pressure, ceasefire, peace initiatives, peace talks) have fallen into the positive part of the connotative meanings of the English language consciousness. The negative ones that characterised the war are armed conflict, the model of a peaceful world, forces and actions, and the main participants of the armed conflict. They received the lowest scores and accounted for the most significant part.

According to the algorithm of mathematical processing of data obtained by using the SD method, a statistical series of measured values – activity, potency (strength), and evaluation (assessment) were created, which are presented below (see Table 2):

Table 2

*The Statistical Series of the Assessments of the “War” Concept on the Semantic Differential Scales by the Sample Within the Range -5–+5*

<b>Scales</b>	-5	-4	-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3	+4	+5
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<b>activity</b>	156	115	68	46	267	229	534	189	285	35
<b>potency</b>	13	22	84	58	52	127	10	10	2	3
<b>evaluation</b>	165	47	48	65	62	100	616	219	245	50

The data of the statistical series allowed the characteristics of the semantic space of the media audience to be calculated according to the formulas of averages and variance. The latter shows that according to the activity parameter, the concept of WAR is evaluated positively and moderately low ( $M = 1.082$ ,  $SD = 1.62$ ). The



concept is evaluated similarly according to the strength parameter ( $M=1.83$ ,  $SD=1.24$ ). Only with the evaluation parameter is the concept of WAR rated as medium-high ( $M = 2.159$ ,  $SD = 1.62$ ), but with significant variance.

At the level of connotative meaning, an increase in the evaluation parameter of the concept of WAR in Ukraine means that the English media audience perceives war events as significant, positively emotionally coloured, and, therefore, as those that cause sympathy and interest.

At the same time, the decrease along with the increase of the activity and strength parameters proves that due to its contradictory dynamics, the concept of WAR and its derivatives violate the coherence of the coordinate system of the semantic space of the media audience. This indirectly indicates the lack of group cohesion in assessing complex social phenomena. From there, it can be assumed that the linguistic slot of the complex concept of WAR and its derivatives is allocated to a separate cognitive context and is the target sphere of influence for difficult-to-understand phenomena of the socio-cultural level.

In general, the results obtained by the semantic differential method showed that the English-speaking audience’s perception (attitudes) of the Ukrainian war is positive and sympathetic but paradoxically an unstable trend. The bipolar dimensions of activity and evaluation’ (affective attitudes) scales are negatively correlated. With increasing tension of military activity in Ukraine, there is a tendency to decrease readability ratings of Ukrainian themes of military aggression in media by English-speaking mass audiences.

## **Conclusions**

The conducted study of the English-language media discourse in modern in the retrospective of the hybrid phase of the Russia-Ukraine war in 2014–2021 made it possible to identify the replacement of the concept “war” in cognitive modelling by the much more gentle and neutral concepts such as “crisis” and “conflict”; to define psycholinguistic techniques as unique markers of “soft” cognitive modelling of a hybrid media event in media; to reveal that with increasing tension of military activity in Ukraine, there is a tendency to decrease the positive attitudes to the victorious war.

The obtained results, both in a theoretical and practical sense, have prospects in developing psycholinguistic and psychological aspects of the media event theory, psychological technologies of hybrid warfare, and cognitive modelling of media discourse and individual linguistic consciousness.

## **Disclosure Statement**

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

## References

- Austin, J. L., & Urmson, J. O. (1962). *How to do things with words: the William James lectures at Harvard University in 1955*. Oxford University Press. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0149.1963.tb00768.x>
- Bacallao-Pino, L.M. (2016). Transmedia events: media coverage of global transactional repertoires of collective action. In B. Mitu, S. Poulakidakos, (Eds.). *Media events: a critical contemporary approach* (pp.189-206). Palgrave Macmillan. [http://doi.org/10.1057/9781137574282\\_11](http://doi.org/10.1057/9781137574282_11)
- Bachmann, S., & Gunneriusson, H. (2015). Russia's hybrid warfare in the east: the integral nature of the information sphere. *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs*, 16(3-4), 198-211.
- Bell, A. (1995). Language and the media. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 15, 23-41. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190500002592>
- Berg, E., & Mölder, M. (2018). The politics of unpredictability: Acc/secession of Crimea and the blurring of international norms. *East European Politics*, 34 (4), 400-417. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21599165.2018.1497986>
- Broslavskaya, L. Ya. (2015). Obrazno-tsinnisnyi skladnyk kontseptu WAR / ВІЙНА в Америцькiй картьни свиту [Imaginative-value constituent of the concept WAR in the American linguistic world image]. *Research Journal of Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University. Series Philology (Linguistics)*, 4, 22-27. Retrieved from [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/nvddpufm\\_2015\\_4\\_6](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/nvddpufm_2015_4_6)
- Buckholz, Q. (2017). The dogs that did not bark: elite preferences and the failure of separatism in Kharkiv and Dnipropetrovsk. *Problems of Post-Communism*, 66(3), 1-10. <http://doi.org/10.1080/10758216.2017.1367256>
- Dayan D., & Katz E. (1992). *Media events: The live broadcasting of history*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Dodonov, R. (2015). *Kryza, viyna chy konflikt – yak korektno nazyvaty podiyi na Skhodi Ukrainy?* [Crisis, war or conflict – how to call the events in eastern Ukraine? Ukrainian Institute for Global Development and Adaptation Strategies. Retrieved from [https://uisgda.com/ua/kryza-vjna\\_21.02.2015\\_chi\\_konflikt\\_-\\_yak\\_korektno\\_nazivati\\_pod\\_na\\_shod\\_ukrani.html](https://uisgda.com/ua/kryza-vjna_21.02.2015_chi_konflikt_-_yak_korektno_nazivati_pod_na_shod_ukrani.html)
- Driscoll, J. (2019). Ukraine's civil war: Would accepting this terminology help resolve the conflict? *PONARS Eurasia Policy Memo*, 572. Retrieved from <http://www.ponarseurasia.org/memo/ukraines-civil-war-wouldaccepting-terminology-help-resolve-conflict>.
- Imbir, K. K. (2017). Valence and origin of emotional words influence subsequent perception of ambiguous stimuli regarding competence versus warmth. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 46, 1549-1571. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10936-017-9505-z>
- Foltovych, V., Korobchynskyi, M., Chyrun, L., & Vysotska, V. (2017). Method of content-analysis of textual information of an online newspaper. *Bulletin of the Lviv Polytechnic National University. Computer Science and Information Technology*, 864, 7-19. Retrieved from [http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/VNULPKNIT\\_2017\\_864\\_4](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/VNULPKNIT_2017_864_4).
- Giles, D. (2003). *Media psychology*. New York University Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781410607263>
- Geeraerts, D. (2006). A rough guide to cognitive linguistics. In D. Geeraerts, (Ed.). *Cognitive linguistics: Basic readings*. (pp. 1-28). Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gomez, M.C. (2009). Towards a new approach to the linguistic definition of euphemism. *Language Sciences*, 31(6), 725–739. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2009.05.001>
- Howard, J (2019b). Dangerous speech. *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 47, 208-254.
- Karimnia, A., & Khodashenas, M. (2016). Winter and spring. Euphemistic strategies used by Iranian EFL learners: death and lying in focus. *The Journal of Applied Linguistics and*

- Applied Literature: Dynamics and Advances*, 4(1), 60-69.  
<http://doi.org/10.22049/jalda.2018.26169.1052>.
- Kellner, D. (2010). Media spectacle and media events. In N. Couldry, A. Hepp, F. Krotz, (Eds.). *Media events in a global age* (pp. 76-91). Routledge.  
<http://doi.org/10.1177/17427665110070020702>
- Lakoff, G. (1993). The contemporary theory of metaphor. In A.Ortony, (Ed.). *Metaphor and thought* (pp. 202-251). 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press.
- Machykova, M. (2015). Media v konteksti psycholingvistyky ta media psycholohii[Media within psycholinguistic and media psychological context]. *East European Journal of Psycholinguistics*, 2(2), 118-126. Retrieved from <http://evnuir.vnu.edu.ua/handle/123456789/9379>
- Matsiyevsky, Yu. (2019). *Vnutrishnii conflict chy prykhovana ahresiiia: Akademichna dyskusiiia i ekspertni otsinky viyny na Dondasi* [Internal conflict or hidden aggression: competing accounts and expert assessments of the war in Ukraine’s Donbas]. *Political Life*, 2, 55-68.  
<http://doi.org/10.31558/2519-2949.2019.2.9>
- Monitorynhovyi proekt “Oko”* [Eye Monitoring Project] (2017). Annual monitoring report “Ukraine in the world’s online media for 2016”. Retrieved from  
[http://967609.istudi03.web.hostingtest.net/wpcontent/uploads/2017/05/Annual\\_report\\_print.pdf](http://967609.istudi03.web.hostingtest.net/wpcontent/uploads/2017/05/Annual_report_print.pdf).
- Naydonova, L. A. (2013). Osnovy mediapsykholohii: Kontseptualna terytoriiia i kohnityvnyi landshaft [Foundations of media psychology: a conceptual territory and cognitive landscape]. *Current Issues of Psychology. Psychology of Creativity*, 12(16), 316-322.  
<http://www.appsychology.org.ua/index.php/ua/arkhiv>
- Neverson, N., & Adeyanju, C.T. (2018). Worth a thousand words: tasers, new media events, and narrative struggle. *Journalism Studies*, 19(11), 1633-1651.  
<http://doi.org/10.1080/1461670x.2017.1289113>
- Nye, J. S. (Jnr) (2011). *The future of power*. Public Affairs.
- Osgood, C.E. (1952). The nature and measurement of meaning. *Psychological Bulletin*, 49, 197-237.  
<https://doi.org/10.1037/h0055737>
- Panther, K., & Thornburg, L. (2017). Metaphor and metonymy in language and thought: a cognitive linguistic approach. *Synthesis Philosophica*, 64(2), 271–294.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.21464/sp32202>
- Pavlenko, V.V. (2015). Kohnityvnyi pidhid do vyvchennia media dyskursu [Cognitive approach to media discourse study]. *State and Regions. Series Social Communication*, 4(24). 48-51.
- Rumyantseva, E.A. (2014). Political metaphor in Ukraine (on the material of English-language media). *Language and Culture*, 17(3), 18–28.
- Saussure, F. de (1995). *Cours de Linguistique Générale*. Publié par Ch. Bally et A. Séchehaye; avec la collaboration de A. Riedlinger; ed. critique préparée par T. de Mauro; postf. de L. J. Calvet. Payot. <http://doi.org/10.1093/fs/50.1.109-a>
- Sumiala, J., Tikka, M., Huhtamäki, J., & Valaskivi, K. (2016). #JeSuisCharlie: Towards a multi-method study of hybrid media events. *Media and Communication*, 4(4), 97-108.  
<https://doi.org/10.17645/mac.v4i4.593>
- Taranenko, O. V. (2017a). Dolannia evfemizatsii v “movi viyny” Ukrainskohi mediinoho ta politychnoho dyskursu [Overcoming euphemism in the “language of war” of Ukrainian media and political discourse]. *Journalistic Sciences*, 883, 139-143. Retrieved from  
[http://ena.lp.edu.ua:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/ntb/43013/2017n883\\_Taranenko\\_Overcoming\\_euphemization\\_139-143.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y](http://ena.lp.edu.ua:8080/xmlui/bitstream/handle/ntb/43013/2017n883_Taranenko_Overcoming_euphemization_139-143.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y).
- Tatsenko, N. V. (2013). Semantic and pragmatic aspects of euphemism in English-language political discourse (based on the material of Barack Obama’s speeches). *Scientific notes of the Taurida V. I. Vernadsky National University. Series Philology. Social Communications*, 26(65), 1, 164-168

- Vasianovych, Ye. (2018). Strukturno-semantychne napovnennia kontseptu “Viyna” u lingvistychnykh doslidzhenniakh [Structural-semantic meaning of the “War” concept in linguistic research. *Humanities Education in Technical Higher Educational Institutions*, 38, 5-10. <https://doi.org/10.18372/2520-6818.38.13255>
- Vilchynska, T. P. (2017). Kontsept “viyna”: Osoblyvosti movnoiyi obiektyvatsii u hazetnomy teksti [The concept of “war”: features of linguistic objectification in a newspaper text]. *Linguistic Studies*, 34, 110-114.
- Zasiekina, L. V. (2010). Profiles of word meaning as a function of cognition and culture. *Scientific Notes of National University of Ostroh Academy. Series Psychology and Pedagogy*, 14, 66-75.